

DATE, et al., 10/047,102
21 September 2007 Amendment
Responsive to 21 June 2007 Office Action

500.37453CX2 / E4690-08EO
Page 5

REMARKS

This paper is responsive to any paper(s) indicated above, and is responsive in any other manner indicated below.

PENDING CLAIMS

Claims 1 and 4-8 were pending, under consideration and subjected to examination in the Office Action. Appropriate claims have been amended, canceled and/or added (without prejudice or disclaimer) in order to adjust a clarity and/or focus of Applicant's claimed invention. That is, such changes are unrelated to any prior art or scope adjustment and are simply refocused claims in which Applicant is present interested. At entry of this paper, Claims 1 and 4-8 will be pending for further consideration and examination in the application.

"PROVISIONAL" DOUBLE-PATENTING

It is respectfully noted that any present double-patenting rejection(s) is only a "provisional" double-patenting rejection. As a result, Applicant respectfully submits a traversal, but refrains from commenting further on a substance of the rejection at this time, until an actual double-patenting rejection is made.

If a situation arises where the only remaining issue blocking allowance is the double-patenting rejection(s), the Examiner is herein requested to telephone the Undersigned at the local Washington, D.C. area telephone number of 703-312-6600, for the possible immediate preparation/filing of a terminal disclaimer to move the application to allowance.

DATE, et al., 10/047,102
21 September 2007 Amendment
Responsive to 21 June 2007 Office Action

500.37453CX2 / E4690-08EO
Page 6

EARLIEST-FILED "PROVISIONALLY-REJECTED" APPLICATION

It is respectfully noted that this is the earliest-filed application of the applications involved in the present "provisional" double-patenting rejection. MPEP 804 states (in relevant part) that: "If a "provisional" nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting (ODP) rejection is the only rejection remaining in the earlier filed of the two pending applications, while the later-filed application is rejectable on other grounds, the examiner should withdraw that rejection and permit the earlier-filed application to issue as a patent without a terminal disclaimer." Withdrawal of the "provisional" double-patenting rejection, and allowance of the present (earliest-filed) application, are respectfully requested.

'101 REJECTION - BEAUREGARD CLAIM(S)

Claims 4 and 7 have been rejected under 35 USC 101, apparently because such claims were allegedly not written in an acceptable Beauregard format. Applicant respectfully submits that appropriate ones of the rejected claims have been rewritten in another manner believed to be a proper Beauregard format. Based upon the foregoing, reconsideration and withdrawal of the '101 rejection are respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 USC '102

The 35 USC '102 rejection of claims 1 and 4-8 as being anticipated by Miike et al. (U.S. Patent 5,787,414) is respectfully traversed. However, such rejections

DATE, et al., 10/047,102
21 September 2007 Amendment
Responsive to 21 June 2007 Office Action

500.37453CX2 / E4690-08EO
Page 7

have been rendered obsolete by the present clarifying amendments to Applicant's claims, and accordingly, traversal arguments are not appropriate at this time. However, Applicant respectfully submits the following to preclude renewal of any such rejections against Applicant's clarified claims.

All descriptions of Applicant's disclosed and claimed invention, and all descriptions and rebuttal arguments regarding the applied prior art, as previously submitted by Applicant in any form, are repeated and incorporated hereat by reference. Further, all Office Action statements regarding the prior art rejections are respectfully traversed. As additional arguments, Applicant respectfully submits the following remarks supplied from Applicant's foreign representative.

All descriptions of Applicant's disclosed and claimed invention, and all descriptions and rebuttal arguments regarding the applied prior art, as previously submitted by Applicant in any form, are repeated and incorporated hereat by reference. Further, all Office Action statements regarding the prior art rejections are respectfully traversed.

In order to properly support a '102 anticipatory-type rejection, any applied art reference must disclose each and every limitation of any rejected claim. The applied art does not adequately support a '102 anticipatory-type rejection because, at minimum, such applied art does not disclose (or suggest) the following discussed limitations of Applicant's claims. That is, Applicant respectfully submits the following comments from Applicant's foreign patent representative.

According to Applicant's invention, a first recording time and a last recording time for a still picture group are recorded as still picture group management

DATE, et al., 10/047,102
21 September 2007 Amendment
Responsive to 21 June 2007 Office Action

500.37453CX2 / E4690-08EO
Page 8

information in a storage medium. The first recording time is a time when one still picture data among a plurality of still picture data belonging to one still picture group, was first recorded. And the last recording time is a time when one still picture data among a plurality of still picture data belonging to the one still picture group, was recorded last. For example, assuming that a certain still picture group includes five still picture data (the first to fifth still picture data) recorded in the medium, the first recording time is a recording time of the first still picture data, and the last recording time is a recording time of the fifth still picture data in such still picture group. That is, the first and the last recording times are recorded for each still picture group. The means for reading out the still picture data (VOB) reads out a desired still picture data from the medium based on the first and last recording time for each still picture group. The data retrieving is made by still picture group basis.

The cited reference Miike et al. teaches to record the start time and end time of editing of an independent document (not a group of documents). Miike et al. does not teach the first recording time when one still picture data among a plurality of still picture data belonging to one still picture group and the last recording time when one still picture data among a plurality of still picture data belonging to the one still picture group was recorded last. Miike et al does not teach that the first and the last recording times are recorded for each still picture group. Miike et al. does not suggest group of document basis concept. Miike et al does not disclose the means for reading out the still picture data (VOB) by still picture group basis.

In addition to the above comments from Applicant's foreign patent representative, the following additional comments are respectfully submitted by the

DATE, et al., 10/047,102
21 September 2007 Amendment
Responsive to 21 June 2007 Office Action

500.37453CX2 / E4690-08EO
Page 9

Undersigned. More particularly, the Miike et al. portions pointed to by the Examiner within the Office Action (e.g., page 6, last paragraph) have been carefully reviewed, and appear not to support the 102 anticipatory-type rejection of Applicant's claims. That is, Applicant's claims (e.g., using independent claim 1 as an example) recite:

"wherein said still picture group management information includes a first recording time at which the still picture data in said still picture group was recorded first and a last recording time at which the still picture data in said still picture group was recorded last".

The Miike et al. columns 49-50 text pointed to within the Office Action, include a "starting time" and an "ending time" with are unrelated to a still picture group. More particularly, the Miike et al. columns 49-50 "starting time" and "ending time" appear to be user-selected (i.e., entered) times for setting a time period range to retrieve all documents having access information within such range. Thus the Miike et al. disclosure does not appear to be particularly relevant to Applicant's claimed invention.

As a result of all of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the applied art (taken alone and in the Office Action combinations) would not support a '102 obviousness-type rejection of Applicant's claims. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of such '102 rejection, and express written allowance of all of the '102 rejected claims, are respectfully requested.

Sep 21 07 11:17P

K Skwierawski

7032662823

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

p.11

SEP 21 2007

DATE, et al., 10/047,102
21 September 2007 Amendment
Responsive to 21 June 2007 Office Action

500.37453CX2 / E4690-08EO
Page 10

EXAMINER INVITED TO TELEPHONE

The Examiner is herein invited to telephone the undersigned attorneys at the local Washington, D.C. area telephone number of 703/312-6600 for discussing any Examiner's Amendments or other suggested actions for accelerating prosecution and moving the present application to allowance.

RESERVATION OF RIGHTS

It is respectfully submitted that any and all claim amendments and/or cancellations submitted within this paper and throughout prosecution of the present application are without prejudice or disclaimer. That is, any above statements, or any present amendment or cancellation of claims (all made without prejudice or disclaimer), should not be taken as an indication or admission that any objection/rejection was valid, or as a disclaimer of any scope or subject matter.

Applicant respectfully reserves all rights to file subsequent related application(s) (including reissue applications) directed to any/all previously claimed limitations/features which have been subsequently amended or cancelled, or to any/all limitations/features not yet claimed, i.e., Applicant continues (indefinitely) to maintain no intention or desire to dedicate or surrender any limitations/features of subject matter of the present application to the public.

SEP 21 2007

DATE, et al., 10/047,102
21 September 2007 Amendment
Responsive to 21 June 2007 Office Action

500.37453CX2 / E4690-08EO
Page 11

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims listed above as presently being under consideration in the application are now in condition for allowance.

To the extent necessary, Applicant petitions for an extension of time under 37 CFR '1.136. Authorization is herein given to charge any shortage in the fees, including extension of time fees and excess claim fees, to Deposit Account No. 01-2135 (Case No. 500.37453CX2) and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Based upon all of the foregoing, allowance of all presently-pending claims is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

ANTONELLI, TERRY, STOUT & KRAUS, LLP
Paul J. Skwierawski
/Paul J. Skwierawski/
Paul J. Skwierawski
Registration No. 32,173

PJS/slk
(703) 312-6600